

1 LISA K. HORGAN, Bar No. 267632  
lhorgan@littler.com  
2 COURTNEY M. OSBORN, Bar No. 312011  
cosborn@littler.com  
3 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.  
333 Bush Street  
4 34th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94104  
5 Telephone: 415.433.1940  
Facsimile: 415.399.8490

6 JAMES J. OH, (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
7 joh@littler.com  
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.  
8 321 N. Clark Street, Suite 1000  
Chicago, IL 60654  
9 Telephone: 312.795.3261  
Facsimile: 312.602.3807

10 Attorneys for Defendants  
11 NATIONWIDE MUTUAL INSURANCE  
COMPANY and SCOTTSDALE INSURANCE  
12 COMPANY

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
16

17 JULIAN FRASER, JOSEPH WUCHER,  
18 IRENE DAMSKY, KIM ZAIA, and  
CHRIS JACKSON as individuals and in  
their representative capacity,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 NATIONWIDE MUTUAL INSURANCE  
22 COMPANY, a corporation,  
SCOTTSDALE INSURANCE  
23 COMPANY, dba Nationwide  
E&S/Specialty, a corporation,

24 Defendants.  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. 3:17-cv-03702-EMC

**REVISED JOINT REQUEST AND  
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING  
APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT  
AND DISMISSAL OF THE ACTION**

1 STEVEN G. ZIEFF (SBN: 84222)  
2 Email: sgz@rezlaw.com  
3 CHAYA M. MANDELBAUM (SBN: 239084)  
4 Email: cmm@rezlaw.com  
5 WILLIAM P. MCELHINNY (SBN: 296259)  
6 Email: wpm@rezlaw.com  
7 RUDY, EXELROD, ZIEFF & LOWE, L.L.P.  
8 351 California Street, Suite 700  
9 San Francisco, CA 94104  
10 Telephone: (415) 434-9800  
11 Facsimile: (415) 434-0513  
12  
13 Attorneys for Plaintiffs,  
14 JULIAN FRASER, *et al.*  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Plaintiffs Julian Fraser, Joseph Wucher, Irene Damsky, Kim Zaia, and Chris Jackson  
2 (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendants Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company and Scottsdale Insurance  
3 Company (“Defendants”), through their respective counsel of record, jointly submit and request as  
4 follows:

- 5 1. Plaintiffs filed a Complaint against Defendant Nationwide Mutual Insurance  
6 Company on or about June 28, 2017, in the Northern District of California pleading  
7 ten causes of action, including a claim under the California Private Attorneys General  
8 Act (“PAGA”), seeking civil penalties for the State of California. There are no class  
9 action or collective action allegations in the Complaint.
- 10 2. On September 26, 2017, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint asserting the  
11 same causes of action but adding Scottsdale Insurance Company as an additional  
12 defendant.
- 13 3. The Parties engaged in mediation on April 2, 2018 with experienced mediator Jeffrey  
14 Ross. The Parties continued negotiations with the assistance of Mr. Ross following  
15 the mediation and reached a settlement. The Parties fully executed a confidential  
16 settlement agreement on or about June 19, 2018.
- 17 4. Pursuant to the settlement agreement, the settlement amount apportioned to PAGA  
18 civil penalties is \$16,000.00, subject to the Court’s approval as required by Labor  
19 Code section 2699(1)(2). Defendants have agreed to pay \$12,000, which is 75% of  
20 \$16,000, to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency following the  
21 dismissal of this action.
- 22 5. The settlement was negotiated at arm’s-length by experienced counsel well versed in  
23 the intricacies of litigation before a well-respected mediator. During the mediation,  
24 Mr. Ross communicated to Plaintiffs that he believed the underlying overtime claims  
25 were stronger than many of the derivative claims, such as meal and rest breaks or  
26 waiting time penalties, that would require additional difficult elements of proof even  
27 if Plaintiffs prevailed in establishing that they were misclassified, which would be  
28 challenging in its own right. For instance, a jury could find that the Plaintiffs, who

1 often worked from home or on the road, were capable of taking the full meal and rest  
2 breaks a non-exempt employee would be entitled to. As a consequence, the overtime  
3 claims and alleged damages for overtime drove Plaintiffs' assessment of what a well-  
4 calibrated settlement would be during the mediation. There are also litigation risks  
5 unique to the PAGA claims. For example, if the matter were to go to trial, there is the  
6 risk that the Court could exercise its discretion under PAGA to not award the full  
7 measure of penalties available under that statute given the difficult exemption issues  
8 underlying the alleged violations and the issues going to whether there was a good  
9 faith dispute as to the exemption status of the Plaintiffs.

10 6. Nonetheless, after reaching resolution, the amount allocated to PAGA represents  
11 approximately the same proportion of Plaintiffs' computed total PAGA penalties as  
12 the proportion of total computed damages allocated to Plaintiffs directly in settlement  
13 of their underlying claims, when adjusted for the extra weight Plaintiffs placed on the  
14 overtime claims, which they viewed to carry less litigation risk than the remaining  
15 claims. The majority of the Plaintiffs were former employees at the time the case was  
16 filed, and thus have very few workweeks within the one-year PAGA statute of  
17 limitations period. Plaintiffs Wucher, Damsky and Fraser have 2, 11 and 22 PAGA-  
18 eligible workweeks respectively. *See* Declaration of Steven G. Zieff in Support of this  
19 Request, ¶ 7.<sup>1</sup>

20 7. The Parties agree that the settlement is specifically limited to Plaintiffs' claims only,  
21 and does not release any PAGA claims of any other alleged aggrieved employees, to  
22 the extent any such individuals exist. Defendants will not assert and waive any  
23 collateral estoppel or res judicata defense that would rely on the settlement in this  
24 matter (but do not waive any other collateral estoppel or res judicata defense that may

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> The Zieff Declaration, which includes the full length settlement agreement as an exhibit, addresses  
27 the Court's Order (Dkt. No. 55) that the Parties provide additional detail sufficient to allow the Court  
28 to understand and assess how the PAGA allocation was calculated and the proportion of the total  
settlement it represents. Because it contains confidential information pertaining to the Parties'  
settlement, it is filed separately and attached to an Administrative Motion to File Under Seal  
pursuant to Northern District Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5.

otherwise exist) to PAGA actions brought by the State of California or aggrieved employees (other than Plaintiffs) for the same claims.

8. Accordingly, this request for PAGA approval is to approve the settlement of Plaintiffs' individual PAGA claims, not the claims of any other alleged aggrieved employees. Moreover, as this is not a class or collective action, no class action or collection action notices have gone out to any other employees, and thus there is no basis to presume any employees have or will forestall pursuit of their own individual or PAGA claims in reliance of this case.

9. The Parties have further agreed to seek the dismissal of this action with prejudice as to Plaintiffs and without prejudice as to other purported "aggrieved employees," to the extent any such individuals exist, with the Court to retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement.

10. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(1)(2), the court shall review and approve any settlement of any civil action filed pursuant to the PAGA.

11. Labor Code section 2699(1)(2) does not prescribe any procedure for how to request Court approval of a PAGA settlement.

12. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(1)(2), the proposed settlement terms were submitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") on June 29, 2018 through the concurrent submission of the joint request submitted to the Court on the same day. As of the time of this filing, the LWDA has not responded to notification of the proposed settlement.

Based on the foregoing, the Parties request:

1. The Court approve the settlement amount apportioned to Plaintiffs' PAGA claim in the amount of \$16,000.00 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(1)(2); and
2. The Court dismiss this action with prejudice as to Plaintiffs and without prejudice as to other purported "aggrieved employees," to the extent any such individuals exist, with the Court to retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement.

1  
2  
3 Dated: July 25, 2018

Respectfully submitted,  
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.

6 /s/ Lisa K. Horgan  
LISA K. HORGAN  
JAMES J. OH  
COURTNEY M. OSBORN  
Attorneys for Defendants

9 Dated: July 25, 2018

Respectfully submitted,  
RUDY, EXELROD, ZIEFF & LOWE, LLP

12 /s/ Chaya M. Mandelbaum  
STEVEN G. ZIEFF  
CHAYA M. MANDELBAUM  
WILLIAM P. MCELHINNY  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

16 **FILER'S ATTESTATION**

17 Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1, I, the filer of this document, attest that all other signatories listed,  
18 and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized the  
19 filing.  
20

21 /s/ Lisa K. Horgan  
Lisa K. Horgan  
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER**

**THE COURT HEREBY FINDS**, having read and considered the Joint Request for approval of a Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) settlement and the dismissal of this action,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

Good cause exists to approve the PAGA settlement of \$16,000.00 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(1)(2) and the settlement is so approved.

This action is now hereby dismissed in its entirety with prejudice as to Plaintiffs and without prejudice as to the “aggrieved employees,” other than Plaintiffs, to the extent any such individuals exist.

Defendants shall pay \$12,000, which is 75% of \$16,000, to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) within twenty-one (21) business days after the dismissal of this action.

This Court shall retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement. Plaintiffs are hereby ordered to submit a copy of this Order to the LWDA within ten (10) days after its entry.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: August 3, 2018



THE HONORABLE EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge

Firmwide:155973348.3 092236.1005